UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/580,660	03/08/2007	Robert Hofmeister	DEBE:066US/10605466	1727

32425 7590 09/15/2008

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.
600 CONGRESS AVE.
SUITE 2400
AUSTIN, TX 78701

EXAMINER	
NATARAJAN, MEERA	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1643	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/15/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/580,660	HOFMEISTER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MEERA NATARAJAN	1643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 June 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *26-50* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *30-50* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *26-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/30/2006*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, Claims 26-29 and species CD19 and SEQ ID NO:1 in the reply filed on 06/2/2008 is acknowledged.

2. Claims 30-50 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 06/02/2008.

3. Claims 26-29 will be examined on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

6. The Claim is drawn to a polypeptide having a sequence which is at least 70% homologous to SEQ ID NO:1.

7. The Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C § 112, paragraph 1 "Written Description" requirement make clear that the written

description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the genus (Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4 pages 1099-1111, Friday January, 2001, See especially page 1106 3rd column).

8. Regarding the instant claim limitations, the specification does not appear to provide an adequate written description for a polypeptide having a sequence which is "at least 70% homologous to SEQ ID NO:1". The present claim reads on any polypeptide having 70% homology to SEQ ID NO:1 and binds to human CD19 antigen. Applicant fails to provide any identifying characteristics, physical or chemical properties, or a correlation between function and structure of the claimed 70% homologous to SEQ ID NO:1 polypeptide. Applicants do not provide specific detail on which amino acids are necessary for binding to CD19. Therefore, the specification does not provide for sufficient written description to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, Applicant had possession of a reasonable number of sequences which are 70% homologous to SEQ ID NO:1, which retain the function of binding to CD19.

9. *Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the

written description inquiry, whatever is now claimed." (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116.) Consequently, Applicant was not in possession of the instant claimed invention. See *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.* 43 USPQ2d 1398.

10. Applicant is directed to the final Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001.

11. Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. § 112 is severable from its enablement provision. (See page 1115.)

12. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a composition comprising a polypeptide having a sequence that is 100% identical to SEQ ID NO:1, does not reasonably provide enablement for a composition comprising a polypeptide having a sequence that is at least 70% homologous to SEQ ID NO:1. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

13. The claims are drawn to a polypeptide comprising at least two antigen binding sites, CD3 and CD19, and comprises at least 70% homology to SEQ ID NO: 1. The

claims read on an antibody with alterations in the CDRs which could affect antigen binding.

14. It is well established in the art that the formation of an intact antigen-binding site generally requires the association of the complete heavy and light chain variable regions of a given antibody, each of which consists of three CDRs which provide the majority of the contact residues for the binding of the antibody to its target epitope. The amino acid sequences and conformations of each of the heavy and light chain CDRs are critical in maintaining the antigen binding specificity and affinity which is characteristic of the parent immunoglobulin. It is expected that all of the heavy and light chain CDRs in their proper order and in the context of framework sequences which maintain their required conformation, are required in order to produce a protein having antigen-binding function and that proper association of heavy and light chain variable regions is required in order to form functional antigen binding sites. Even minor changes in the amino acid sequences of the heavy and light variable regions, particularly in the CDRs, may dramatically affect antigen-binding function as evidenced by Rudikoff et al (Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 1982 Vol 79 page 1979). Rudikoff et al. teach that the alteration of a single amino acid in the CDR of a phosphocholine-binding myeloma protein resulted in the loss of antigen-binding function. MacCallum et al. J. Mol. Biol. (1996) 262, 732-745, analyzed many different antibodies for interactions with antigen and state that although CDR3 of the heavy and light chain dominate, a number of residues outside the standard CDR definitions make antigen contacts (see page 733, right col) and non-contacting residues within the CDRs coincide with residues as

important in defining canonical backbone conformations (see page 735, left col.). Pascalis et al. The Journal of Immunology (2002) 169, 3076-3084 demonstrate that grafting of the CDRs into a human framework was performed by grafting CDR residues and maintaining framework residues that were deemed essential for preserving the structural integrity of the antigen binding site (see page 3079, right col.). Although abbreviated CDR residues were used in the constructs, some residues in all 6 CDRs were used for the constructs (see page 3080, left col.). The fact that not just one CDR is essential for antigen binding or maintaining the conformation of the antigen binding site, is underscored by Casset et al. (2003) BBRC 307, 198-205, which constructed a peptide mimetic of an anti-CD4 monoclonal antibody binding site by rational design and the peptide was designed with 27 residues formed by residues from 5 CDRs (see entire document). Casset et al. also states that although CDR H3 is at the center of most if not all antigen interactions, clearly other CDRs play an important role in the recognition process (page 199, left col.) and this is demonstrated in this work by using all CDRs except L2 and additionally using a framework residue located just before the H3 (see page 202, left col.). Vajdos et al. (2002) 320, 415-428, additionally state that antigen binding is primarily mediated by the CDRs more highly conserved framework segments which connect the CDRs are mainly involved in supporting the CDR loop conformations and in some cases framework residues also contact antigen (page 416, left col.). Holm et al. (2007) 44, 1075-1084 describes the mapping of an anti-cytokeratin antibody where although residues in the CDR3 of the heavy chain were involved in antigen binding unexpectedly a residue in CDR2 of the light chain was also involved (abstract).

Chen et al. J. Mol. Bio. (1999) 293, 865-881. describe high affinity variant antibodies binding to VEGF wherein the results show that the antigen binding site is almost entirely composed of residues from heavy chain CDRs, CDR-H1, H2, H3 (page 866). Wu et al. J. Mol. Biol. (1999) 294, 151-162. state that it is difficult to predict which framework residues serve a critical role in maintaining affinity and specificity due in part to the large conformational change in antibodies that accompany antigen binding (page 152 left col.) but certain residues have been identified as important for maintaining conformation.

15. The references demonstrate that an antibody must comprise all 6 CDRs in order to maintain the antigen binding specificity and affinity which is characteristic of the immunoglobulin.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

16. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

17. Claims 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dorken et al. (US Patent 7112324).

18. The claims are drawn to a composition comprising a polypeptide comprising at least two antigen binding sites, wherein said at least two antigen binding sites are located on a single polypeptide chain and wherein one antigen binding site specifically

binds the human CD3 antigen and the other binding site specifically binds to the human CD19 antigen comprising SEQ ID NO:1.

19. Dorken et al. teach "single-chain multifunctional polypeptides comprising at least two binding sites specific for the CD19 and CD3 antigen" (see Abstract). Dorken et al. teach a polypeptide with binding sites specifically to human CD19 antigen and wherein said polypeptide has a sequence that is 100% homologous to SEQ ID NO: 1 (see attached alignment). The limitation recited in the claims wherein said polypeptide constitutes no more than 5% of the total weight of the combined monomeric and multimeric forms of said polypeptide are described in the specification to be achieved through methods of "enrichment" involving resolution ion-exchange HPLC, high resolution size exclusion chromatography, gel purification, etc (see specification p.12-13). Dorken et al. disclose methods of purification involving "imidazole gradient", gel filtration (see Fig. 14 legend), cation exchange chromatography (see fig. 12 legend), gel electrophoresis (see Fig. 11 legend), etc. Based on the teachings provided in the instant specification, the methods of purification taught by Dorken et al. would result in a polypeptide constituting no more than 5% of the total weight of the combined monomeric and multimeric forms of said polypeptide.

Conclusion

20. Claims 26-29 are rejected

21. No Claim is allowed

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MEERA NATARAJAN whose telephone number is (571)270-3058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 9:30AM-7:00PM, ALT. Friday. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms can be reached on 571-272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MN

/Larry R. Helms/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1643